DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 170 HE 004 329

AUTHOR	Anderson, R.; Salter, W.
TITLE	A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel, Volume I: Introduction and Summary of Findings. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	AAI-72-134
PUB DATE	25 Feb 73
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-3712
NOTE	34p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; *College Faculty; Educational Programs; *Higher Education; Manpower Utilization; Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Needs; Research; Research Projects; *Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

Volume I of a four-volume study of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) training programs for higher education personnel presents introductory information and study findings. The first section addresses the three major concerns of the study: (1) What new professional training does American higher education need? (2) How do current EPDA V-E programs address these needs? and (3) What new developments seem likely to affect training needs in the future? The second section presents a legislative review of EPDA. Emphasis is placed on the legislative environment and objectives, manpower supply and demand, information, and legislative development. Section 3 indicates the three-faceted approach used in the study: a survey to assess training needs; a profiling system to collect and organize EPDA V-E program information on a regular basis; and a set of case studies of institutions representing important new trends in higher education. The fourth section presents a summary of findings. A 20-item bibliography is included. Related documents are HE 004 330, HE 004 331, and HE 004 332. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

HE

ED 076170

A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs For Higher Education Personnel

For: Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
U. S. Office of Education

By: Abt Associates Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 329

Volume I: Introduction and Summary of Findings

ED 076170

ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
55 WHEELER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
TELEPHONE • AREA 617-492-7100
TELEX 710-320-6367

Prepared For:

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Contract No. OEC-0-71-3712

Principal Authors:

R. Anderson
W. Salter

A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel

Volume I

Introduction and Summary of Findings

- FINAL REPORT -

February 25, 1973

Report No. AAI-72-134

VOLUME I:

INTRODUCTION
AND
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

VOLUME I:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.0	QUESTIONS FOR THE STUDY	1
	1.1 What New Professional Training Does American Higher Education Need?	1
	1.2 How Do Current EPDA V-E Programs Address These Needs?	3
	1.3 What New Developments Seem Likely to Affect Training Needs in the Future?	4
2.0	LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF EPDA	7
	2.1 The Legislative Environment	7
	2.2 The Legislative Objectives	9
	2.3 Manpower Supply and Demand	10
	2.4 Information	13
	2.5 The Legislative Development	16
3.0	THE STUDY APPROACH	17
4.0	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	23
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	29

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The successful completion of this Study required and received the willing cooperation of a wide variety of distinguished and interested people. We owe our deepest thanks to all who joined hands with us.

We are indebted particularly to Mr. Daniel H. Morrissey, the United States Office of Education's Project Monitor for the Study, and to Dr. Salvatore B. Corrallo, the Director of the Division of Post-Secondary and International Planning and Evaluation, through whose office the project was supported. Their patient and perceptive review of our progress kept us on the right track, and their influence in higher education circles facilitated many indispensable contacts.

In developing the rationale and design of the Study, we were fortunate to have the advice of a number of eminent scholars in the higher education field, including Dr. C. Robert Pace and Dr. James W. Trent of the University of California at Los Angeles, Dr. Jane Matson of the California State College at Los Angeles, Dr. Margaret Gordon of the Carnegie Commission, Dr. George Weathersby, Dr. Dale Tillery, and Dr. Lyman Glenny of the University o California at Berkeley, and Dr. Lewis Mayhew and Dr. Frank Newman of Stanford University.

We are grateful to President Justin McCarthy and Dr. Gail Cosgrove of Framingham State College, to President Kermit Morrissey of Boston State College, to Dean John Gianoulis and Dean Donald W. Lovejoy of the Massachusetts Bay Community College, and President Harold E. Shively and Mr. Bill Craft of the North Shore Community College for their generous assistance in designing and pre-testing the various data-gathering instruments that the Study required.

Mr. Mallory Harwell designed and directed the case study phase of this project, and he is the principal author of Volume IV, which reports the results of the Case Studies. Ms. Elizabeth Boyle, Mr. James Leath,

Mr. Ricardo Millett, Mr. William Salter, and Ms. Lorrie Stuart participated in the gathering, analysis, and reporting of case study data.

Ms. Elizabeth Boyle directed the profiling of EPDA Part V-E programs, with the help of Dr. Ulrich F. W. Ernst, Mr. Kenneth Carlson, and Mr. Richard Englebrecht. Ms. Boyle is the principal author of Volume III of this Report.

Dr. Richard B. Anderson, Project Director, and Mr. William Salter designed the IHE Survey, which was carried out primarily by Ms. Diane Stoner and Ms. Anne Whitney of the Abt Associates Survey Design Group. Volumes I and II are Dr. Anderson's work, assisted by Mr. John Butenas and Ms. Margo Giroux.

Special mention is due to Ms. Mary Jo Cornish, the original Project Director, and to Dr. John Kososki, who were responsible for the directions that the Project took in its early days.

Dr. William L. Hamilton of Abt Associates' corporate Research Design Group reviewed the technical aspects of the Project.

1.0 Questions For The Study

Part V-E of the Education Professions Development Act supports training programs for higher education professionals, and represents the major federal thrust in this area. The Office of Education's need for policy-relevant information about higher education training needs in general, and directions for V-E programming in particular, is critical. Training programs have received scant funding in comparison to that provided for other higher education activities, but perhaps this low priority has been appropriate in the past, given the unavailability of solid evidence of the kind and amount of need for training. If general impressions are to be trusted, the professional manpower pendulum in higher education has swung erratically from critical shortage to glut and back again in recent years, in response to rapid social and institutional changes affecting the colleges. Can the traditional numbers of professionals, trained in the traditional ways, respond to the needs of a changing student body that must in turn meet the manpower needs of a rapidly evolving society? Or must new kinds of training be devised, scaled to produce new mixes of professional competence in our colleges? What changes in the current EPDA V-E programs do current conditions imply?

In 1971, the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation of the U.S. Office of Education commissioned Abt Associates Inc., to undertake an investigation into personnel training needs in two-year and four-year colleges and their implication for the Part V-E programs. Since the study represented an exploratory effort, its scope was necessarily broad. Three overall goals were established, each of which involved a number of specific objectives.

1.1 What New Professional Training Does American Higher Education Need?

First of all, and most importantly, what are higher education's current needs to which training may reasonably be expected to respond?

Conventionally, education training and manpower needs are defined in terms of roles - e.g., history instructor, dean of students. Titles vary, however, among and even within types of colleges. Actual roles, duties and real performance requirements, we may presume, are even more diverse. Rather than aggregate our assessments of training need in accordance with traditional role concepts that may no longer efficiently stratify the universe of higher education professionals, we have organized our investigations around the concept of skills, perceived as they are actually required on the job. We conceived of skills in terms of both broad categories - e.g., human relations or management - and specific skills such as curriculum design and fund raising. Within this framework, then, our interest was in determining which general and particular skills were in demand and in what order of priority.

In addition to estimating national training requirement, we aimed to determine which types of institutions and college personnel were most in need of training in general and in terms of specific sets of skills. Where is the need greatest? What kinds of need appear where? The most obvious and certainly a fundamental institutional distinction is that between two-year and four-year colleges. Other characteristics such as size and type of control (i.e., public or private) are also of interest. For describing the training needs of specific kinds of college personnel, we applied a conceptual scheme analogous to that used to analyze skills: we set out to map the skill requirements of both broad personnel groups - e.g., deans, heads of departments - and of particular roles such as financial aid officer.

The policy-maker's purposes would be well served, obviously enough, by a study which would present current and reliably projected skill needs in quantitative terms. In the early phases of the project we investigated the possibility of devising a mathematical projection model to generate such outputs from our findings and from other available data. It became apparent, however, that the data necessary to realize this ambition were not available and could not be gathered within the scope of this project, for both conceptual and methodological

reasons. The notions of "need," "demand," and "skill" are particularly hard to operationalize and measure reliably in the college context. To ask a higher education professional what skills his job requires and whether he has enough of each skill would only be to provoke a flood of self-justification (or nonresponse) from precisely those who could best provide us with evidence of needs. The problem of reactivity is somewhat less if (as we did) we couch the question in terms of the relative desirability of various kinds of training for people in various college roles, including the respondent's own role. There is no obvious way, however, to proceed from judgments of the desirability or importance of training types to quantitative estimates of needs such as a projection model would require.

In the light of these reality constraints, we have directed the study at the more modest objective of identifying and prioritizing needs. Are the needs of two-year colleges more severe and urgent than those of four-year colleges? Are administrators more in need of training than faculty? Are financial skills in greater demand than management skills? We have aimed to describe the basic structure of training need and to supply a base from which further research may proceed.

While the study focuses on training needs, we have also investigated the relative attractiveness to IHE leaders of training and its alternatives, and of various kinds of training, as means of solving the problems that face colleges. Would the leadership of higher education rather retrain existing staff or find new people to fill felt needs? How do in-service activities compare in attractiveness with off-campus training such as EPDA V-E fellowships might provide?

1.2 How Do Current EPDA V-E Programs Address These Needs?

The resources that EPDA V-E has devoted to the training of higher education professionals in February 1970, $9 million for 142 programs with 5000 participants through fellowships and institutions, represents so small a proportion of the total national outlay for higher

education that we could hardly expect these programs to transform the manpower picture and eliminate all its problems. For policy purposes, the central question is qualitative: to what extent do EPDA V-E programming strategies respond to real training needs as perceived by higher education personnel? Are V-E funds alleviating critical skill shortages? Do they influence individuals' decisions to enter specific institutions and careers? Do they support pre-service and in-service training for key groups of personnel? Are they effective in the long term, as measured by the number of trainees who actually pursue careers in necessary fields? What is the quality of the training received through V-E programs? Our task was to suggest answers to these and other questions about the federal role in higher education training, in order to assist the Office of Education to target and design its training programs. This effort was also conceived as contributing to the establishment of an ongoing system for collecting and displaying program information, enabling administrators to review the history and current status of programs individually and comparatively.

1.3 What New Developments Seem Likely to Affect Training Needs in the Future? How?

Our first two goals address the training needs of two-year and four-year colleges today. But higher education is assuredly not a static system. Most observers agree that colleges and universities are changing and innovating far more rapidly and diversely than the elementary-secondary system. New structures and services are evolving in response to new philosophies, new types of students, a changing labor market, and increasing financial and social pressures. Among the more conspicuous trends are universities without walls, granting credit for work experience, and two-year colleges which are more a vocationally oriented extension of high school than an introduction to a four-year liberal arts college.

These developments in turn--if adopted on a broad scale--appear to have the potential to generate new training demands for administrators, teachers, and educational specialists who are skilled in such areas as

institutional development, group dynamics, and placement services. The rise in enrollment of students from less privileged backgrounds, for example, might be creating a need for remedial services and for counseling. While it is not yet clear how much and in what ways higher education might change in the future, such developments as open admissions are certainly visible enough to be taken into consideration in formulating federal training policy. Therefore, we set out to identify significant trends, to analyze their effects on institutional conditions, and to infer their training implications in terms of general and specific skills required by different types of institutions and personnel.

2.0 A Legislative Review of EPDA

What needs did Congress perceive as it went about to set up EPDA? Before describing our approach to this study of current needs and of EPDA's efforts to fulfill them, let us pause and examine the context in which the program came into being.

What went before congressional enactment of EPDA on June 29, 1967, is as important to the program as the aims of the higher education training legislation. The central topics of this section, drawn from committee reports and hearings,[1] include the legislative environment surrounding enactment of EPDA, the objectives of the legislation as it was written, and how the bill has developed legislatively since enactment.

2.1 The Legislative Environment

The authors of EPDA designed the act largely in response to demands generated by other Federal programs growing out of the Great Society legislation (e.g., EPDA provided support for the training of personnel to administer student aid funds authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965). Several of the major forces affecting the enactment of EPDA can be traced to the Johnson Administration through the President's Manpower Report of 1967 (indeed, its approach to manpower problems and even some of the language are similar to House testimony prior to EPDA's enactment, particularly concern-

---

1 A detailed list of sources examined in the writing of this document appears in the Bibliography at the end. In general, these documents included the bills themselves, relevant Congressional reports and committee hearings, publications of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, periodicals published by professional associations in higher education, and independent newspapers and magazines. The almost complete absence of attention to EPDA higher education programs in non-USOE publications suggests that these programs were of relatively low priority among all EPDA programs and that they received little attention from participants in the higher education process before legislation was enacted.

Transcripts of hearings prior to the original enactment of EPDA in 1967 were found by means of an extensive search through Congressional indexes. The House and Senate passed H.R. 10943 on June 29, 1967. H.R. 10943, however, was a hybrid of two House bills, H.R. 6232 and H.R. 6265. Congressional indexes list all testimony under the latter two bills and show no testimony on record for H.R. 10943.

ing consolidation, response to the teacher shortage, and generation of information).

Demand for such an act also came from within OE. The 1967 Manpower Report identified the "advent of Great Society programs" as one of the forces affecting the demand for teachers, and two different OE articles speak of the internally generated demand: in one, Don Davies describes EPDA as acknowledging "that we put the cart before the horse. The act says, in effect, that none of the new education measures...can be effective without people prepared to make them effective."[2] The second article, also demonstrating the line of thought in much of OE testimony, points out that the Federal aid programs create a need for competent administrators.

This situation closely parallels that of the field of health planning: Federal funds to support comprehensive health planning have created a severe shortage of health planners. No studies have shown that such planning assures a better quality of health care. Likewise, no studies have shown that EPDA training programs improve the quality of teaching or streamline the administration of schools and colleges.

The House version of EPDA was rammed through the Senate in return for House concessions on other bills. There was an almost total absence of public comment on EPDA in the press prior to its enactment, and the Senate report on the act confirms the haste with which it passed the Senate. Senator Peter Dominick (R-Colo.), in an addendum to the Senate report, complained:

> The Senate is here being forced to ransom the Teachers Corps -- the authority for which expires June 20 -- by enacting without due committee deliberation and without amendment the $775 million new obligational authority contained in the education professions development program as a legislative companion piece to continuation of the Teachers Corps...the subcommittee process was so hurried that the stenographic transcript of the Friday, June 23 hearings was sent to the Government Printing

---

2 Don Davies [1], p. 29.

> Office that very day, without correction, to go immediately into page proofs...we were obliged to accept the House language intact.[3]

But underlying all considerations of EPDA's enactment was and is the scarcity of information regarding the need for EPDA programs. Since inception to this date Congress has complained of the lack of information. OE has readily conceded the lack. Congress almost exclusively relied on OE experience, expertise and testimony; IHE participation was modest. Training programs for higher education personnel have had a rather low priority status among EPDA's concerns, and OE has had difficulty in clearly demonstrating the need for the proposed training and fellowship programs in higher education.

2.2 The Legislative Objectives

The overriding objectives of EPDA included:

- to consolidate federal teacher training programs at all levels of education so as to achieve some efficiency in their administration;
- to meet critical manpower shortages at all levels of education; and
- to provide Congress with a continuing flow of information on educational manpower needs and on the results of federal programs in meeting those needs.

In addition, the Statement of Purpose of the act itself added two other objectives: "attracting a greater number of qualified persons

---

3 Report No. 363, pp. 37-38.

into the teaching profession" and "attracting persons who can stimulate creativity in the arts and other skills to undertake short-term or long-term assignments in education."[4]

With Part E, EPDA provided support for programs to assist institutions of higher education in "training persons who are serving or preparing to serve as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in institutions of higher education" by means of "short-term or regular session institutes" and "fellowships or traineeships."[5]

2.3 Manpower Supply and Demand

The Manpower Report of 1967 called for an effort to make programs more efficient by centralizing, consolidating, and streamlining the manpower operations and by coordinating manpower programs more closely with others (such as educational programs). Said then-HEW Secretary John W. Gardner before the House Committee on Education and Labor, "the legislation under consideration...would create new and comprehensive authority for the training of all types of educational personnel--The Education Professions Act."[6] He added, "In the last 10 years we have seen a series of manpower needs but we have tended to do it in piecemeal fashion. The whole movement of the Education Professions Act is to examine all educational manpower in its totality."[7]

Specifically, EPDA had been consolidating teacher training programs under four major acts: the experienced teacher fellowship

---

4 Public Law 90-35, p. 1.

5 Ibid., p. 12.

6 Higher Education Amendments of 1967, p. 23; There seems to have been some confusion about the title of the act. Until its enacement, the bill was referred to variously as the Education Professions Act, the Education Professions Program, the Educational Professions Development Act, and the Education Professions Development Act.

7 Ibid., p. 32.

program (under the Higher Education Act of 1965); counseling and guidance training institutes (NDEA, Title V); teacher training institute programs (NDEA, Title XI); and teacher training institute programs (Section 13, Arts and Humanities Act of 1965).

The 1967 Manpower Report identified shortages relevant to the subsequent enactment of EPDA: "A variety of job market factors, notably the advent of Great Society programs in fields of medical care, education, and social welfare have increased the demand for physicians, nurses, teachers, and social workers, who are already in short supply..."[8] The report stressed two areas of central concern in higher education: the inability of small colleges to recruit sufficient numbers of qualified teachers in several disciplines, and the unmet demand for faculty with training at the doctoral level.[9] Testimony before the House Education Committee echoed the concerns of the Manpower Report, with the Commissioner of Labor Statistics pointing out the "continuing shortage in many fields of people with the doctor's degree."[10]

While both the Manpower Report and the higher education hearings dwelt, in detail, on the supply and demand of elementary and secondary school teachers, neither presented carefully developed data on the need for teachers in higher education. Both gave OE data on the rapid growth of enrollments in higher education (demand) but offered little on the numbers coming from graduate schools (supply).

What was used extensively was the Ph.D. situation, with confusing results. Both the President's report and committee testimony conceded the production of doctorates would be sufficient to overcome the teacher deficit and to increase the proportion of doctoral-level faculty. Yet both reports called for increased support for higher education to meet

---

8 Manpower Report, 1967, 151.

9 EPDA is limited to master's degrees for teachers and doctorates for administrators.

10 Higher Education Amendments of 1967, pp. 202 and 204.

increasing college enrollment and increasing demands for college-trained personnel. The first annual report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development (NACEPD) continued to call for additional doctorates but then attributed this demand to the competition between higher education and other employers for doctoral recipients.

Evidence available in 1967 and now does not support that assertion. Historically, approximately 65 percent of all doctoral recipients have remained in academia; there is evidence that supply caught up with demand in some areas as long as 10 years ago. Too, the net outmigration of Ph.D. holders was approximately zero from 1954 to 1964. Therefore, evidence strongly indicates that the doctoral shortages in 1967 and since have been quickly met. In fact, there is evidence that Ph.D.'s have been moving to positions in junior colleges because of the oversupply of doctorates in four-year colleges and universities. Institutions may have perceived shortages based on their expansion plans and expectations of the increased availability of research funds.

EPDA, then, has continued to support the training of persons who must compete with increasing numbers of doctorates for positions which previously were staffed by non-doctoral personnel. While the need to alleviate doctoral "shortages" can perhaps be questioned, we must also bear in mind that EPDA aimed at improving the quality of teaching:

> By "teacher shortage," for example, most people do not mean that there are many unfilled positions at current salaries, but that the positions are filled with persons who are not as qualified as they should be or who are teaching a larger number of students than is pedagogically desirable. Those who predict future shortages in particular professions usually mean that if present rates of entry into the profession continue, there will not be as many doctors per thousand population or as many college professors per thousand students as they think there should be. (Economics of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, pp. 376-77)[11]

---

11 The Education Professions 1968, p. VII.

Quality considerations permeate EPDA legislation and testimony. In 1967 OE described the primary objectives of EPDA as improving the quality of teaching and meeting "critical shortages of adequately trained manpower."[12] Similar language appears throughout Congressional hearings and other OE publications.

Having created a program to respond to shortages of qualified personnel, and having emphasized that these shortages are not simply numerical, the designers of the program bear the burden of demonstrating that program participants do indeed respond to the quality demands of higher education. Yet the response appeared only in numerical form: in OE documents the results of EPDA responding to manpower shortages (identified as quality shortages) were summarized solely in terms of the numbers of teachers, aides and administrators who have been trained in EPDA projects.

2.4 Information

The absence of quality information on EPDA output raises an important issue. The Manpower Report makes reference to the urgency of this issue:

> The effectiveness of future policies and programs aimed at meeting the economy's need for trained workers will depend to a considerable extent on the availability of comprehensive, detailed, and current information on the nation's manpower requirements and resources.[13]

The report adds that "standard reporting procedures in federally supported training" need to be developed to provide this information.[14]

---

12 Ellis, p. 20; emphasis added.

13 Manpower Report, 1967, p. 162.

14 Ibid., pp. 162-3.

The House report on EPDA also stresses the importance of information in manpower programs:

> Basic to any coordinated attempt to solve our educational manpower shortages is detailed knowledge of specific areas of need....It has been a longwithstanding concern of the committee that the Office of Education has not been able to provide more accurate and timely information on that state of the education professions.[15]

The lack of timely, accurate and comprehensive information appeared vividly in an exchange between then-Secretary Gardner and Representative Ogden R. Reid (R-N.Y.) at a House committee hearing:

> MR. REID: ...As I understand your testimony, there increasingly appear to be shortages, in some cases serious ones. The whole spectrum of professional levels is involved and what would be the shortage in universities and in junior colleges? How much additional trained personnel do we need--professors, instructional staff and the like?
>
> SECRETARY GARDNER: I don't have the figures on that. I don't think any of us here have the figures. This is a high priority with us. I don't think that we are nearly in the trouble in the educational field at any point that we are in the medical field, but in all of the fields in my Department, manpower is a very high priority.
>
> MR. REID: Do you feel we are anywhere near to training enough personnel to meet the needs? I think we are making headway on the classrooms and bricks and mortar, but have we really focused on the shortage of personnel, not alone in the medical field but broadly speaking in universities as well? We are talking about doubling higher educational facilities by 1970 and tripling perhaps by 1985, and are we going to have the good teachers and trained teachers to meet this increase?

---

15 Report No. 383, p. 4.

> SECRETARY GARDNER: I think it is a constant struggle. I think the whole record of the past 20 years has been one of a moving target and an effort to catch up with our own aspirations in the educational field. I think we have done remarkably well in higher education in the last few years. I think we can't afford to let up a minute considering the growth ahead. I think we have to press as hard as we can. This is greatly complicated by the fact that all of these fields compete with one another for the same persons.[16]

The need for information was there from the beginning and the authors of EPDA included a requirement that the Commissioner of Education produce an annual report on the education professions. The first report, The Education Professions 1968, was a 375-page review of teacher supply and demand, prefaced by an apology that "whole areas of concern are omitted" and promising that "in future years, it is planned to deal in considerably greater depth in these areas."[17] (That report drew most heavily on enrollment data and projections previously available from OE and on summaries of output from teacher training programs; the incompleteness of this information was mentioned earlier -- enrollment data concern the demand for teachers, not supply, and numbers of people completing training programs say nothing about the programs responding to the demand for qualified personnel.)

But no report was issued for fiscal 1969 because of "limitations in staff resources and other demands."[18] A single report was issued for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 but it was only 84 pages and a considerably less comprehensive assessment of the education professions than the first report. Its preface apologized for the report's superficiality

---

16 Higher Education Amendments of 1967, pp. 44-45.

17 The Education Professions 1968, p. III; This report was preceded by five months by a summary report of recommendations from NACEPD. The latter contained no data.

18 The Education Professions 1969-70, p. iii.

and said little more could be expected: "there are innumerable issues facing us in recruiting, training, retraining, and deploying educational personnel...We cannot hope to collect and analyze information each year on all of them."[19]

In summary, the Education Professions Development Act was born in the context of severely limited information. Despite the information requirements of the act and despite standardized reporting procedures for EPDA programs, the scarcity of timely, accurate and comprehensive information persists.

2.5 The Legislative Development

Despite drastic changes in the demographic and financial conditions of institutions of higher education, EPDA V-E has undergone virtually no legislative change since 1967 except for its extension and increased level of funding. An overwhelming interest in elementary and secondary school teaching and a neglect of higher education programs again was amply evident in the education hearings and bills of 1968 and 1971; great changes occurred in those programs that received the greatest congressional attention; fewer changes occurred for those that received the least attention.

---

19 The Education Professions 1969-70.

3.0 The Study Approach

Our goals for the study were to determine higher education training needs as perceived by professionals in the field, to assess the relevance of the EPDA V-E programs in meeting these needs, and to study how new developments in higher education might affect training needs and hence the federal response to them. Each of these three requirements presented its own opportunities and constraints. Together they suggested a three-faceted approach to the study:

- a survey to assess training needs
- a profiling system to collect and organize EPDA V-E program information on a regular basis
- a set of case studies of institutions representing important new trends in higher education

The Training Preference Survey

The survey design task, in broad terms, was to develop sampling procedures, classification schemes, questionnaire items, and modes of analysis that would allow us to estimate the popularity of training across different types of IHEs, IHE personnel, and skills. From the outset the focus of the study was on undergraduate institutions rather than universities. They are the primary target of the EPDA V-E programs; they account for the larger portion by far of higher education manpower; their instructional and administrative services differ in many important respects, such as remedial instruction and facilities planning, from those of graduate departments and schools.

We further classified undergraduate IHEs according to college type: two-year or four-year; and form of support: public or private. These factors are already known to have strong implications for a wide range of institutional features: size and characteristics of student

body, proportion of Ph.D.s and tenured faculty, instructional program, finances, placement services, etc. It seemed reasonable to expect that college type and form of support might be associated with training needs as well.

In choosing respondents for our survey, we sought professionals who covered collectively the range of substantive areas in which training might be required, and who had special knowledge and interest in training for their individual areas of expertise. The college president was an obvious choice, in view of his broad responsibilities for assessment of IHE personnel needs, and planning and coordination of training strategies. Five other respondent strata were selected: academic dean; dean of students; vice president for administration; faculty senate president; minority program leader. This last stratum was considered especially appropriate in light of the emphasis of the EPDA V-E program on the preparation of personnel for work with disadvantaged populations.

In designing the survey instrument itself, we tried for coverage of the spectrum of service categories, and for successive levels of detail. The keystone of the instrument was a five-part classification of training needs: human relations skills; managerial skills; training in handling current special problems; information management skills; training in further academic studies. These were further broken down into 11 service categories, e.g., institutional financial management, and 35 training activities, e.g., developing and managing a project. We also introduced IHE roles in addition to the six respondent roles, such as department chairman and educational specialist.

The survey instrument was a product of literature review and extensive consultations with USOE and higher education experts. Two separate questionnaires were actually fielded. The Presidential Questionnaire went to college presidents, who supplied information about their institutions, judged their institutions' training needs, and nominated individuals to fill the five remaining respondent strata. These indi-

viduals, and the presidents as well, were then sent the Training Preference Questionnaire, which dealt with personnel requirements in depth. Their responses allowed us to compute frequency distributions and draw conclusions about training needs at several levels of detail and across several dimensions -- institutions, IHE roles, skills -- relevant to EPDA V-E programming, as discussed in detail in Volume II of this report.

Program Profiling

Since 1969 Part V-E of EPDA has supported training for professionals in higher education through five types of training programs: (1) institutes, (2) short-term training programs, and (3) special projects, which are administered by the Division of College Support; (4) one-year fellowship programs, and (5) two-year fellowship programs, administered by the Division of University Programs. While the IHEs receiving V-E support are required to supply program data to EPDA administrators, this information is not readily available or easily interpreted, and suffers from certain gaps as well.

We were therefore asked to profile the EPDA V-E programs to date, and to develop a system for future profiling. The sample of programs was defined as all 1970 institutes, short-term training programs and special programs, and all 1970 two-year fellowship programs. Our objective was to enable administrators to determine quickly the history and current state of a particular program, and to summarize and compare across programs. To this end, we established five basic information categories: program data; institutional data; cost data; participant data; and response data.

Ease of data collection was also a major consideration. We therefore tried to construct the profiling system around existing EPDA reporting formats, as much as possible. This objective was largely achieved, although we did find it necessary to field a questionnaire to a sample of V-E fellows in order to obtain information in the following

areas: demographics; education and career objectives; the role of EPDA funds in the formation and achievement of those objectives; the effectiveness of training received through the fellowship.

Case Studies of Colleges in Transition

To investigate new trends in higher education and their implications for skilled manpower needs, we employed a case study approach. Case studies were judged to be more appropriate than alternative methodologies such as literature review or surveys for two major reasons. Very little reliable research in this field is yet available. The case study technique is uniquely suited to exploring complex issues such as the consequences for training of changes in admissions policies or instructional programs.

The responsibility for choosing the trends to be studied was ours. From among the many innovations on the American higher education scene today, we tried to select those "scenarios" which seemed to have the greatest potential for wide adoption and for the generation of new training needs. University without walls programs, for example, seem likely to be implemented on a broad scale because of decreased costs and increased responsiveness to client needs and schedules; they also clearly require instructors and administrators who are capable of providing and managing a highly flexible and individualized instructional program. Once we selected the trends to be studied, the Office of Edcuation recommended IHEs in which those trends were well represented. The six scenarios chosen were:

1) a two-year college stressing remedial education

2) an open admissions policy

3) a university without walls program

4) a state college which is becoming certified as a state university

5) a developing Black college

6) a college which is a member of a consortium

Each case study report was the product of two site visits by a field team, the first for reconnaissance and the development of a study plan, the second for in-depth investigation. To allow comparisons across sites and generalizations about shared training needs, we established a common framework or outline for all the case studies. Field analysts were encouraged, however, to adapt our reporting formats to suit the unique realities of their respective sites.

4.0 Summary of Findings

What, then, can we conclude in answer to the questions that motivated this study? Broadly, that American higher education does indeed demand training activities to prepare people to fill professional roles. We found the demand for skilled personnel to be uniformly strong across different types of institutions and institutional decision-makers. The federally supported programs that EPDA brought into existence in 1967 can therefore be said to address a major need in the colleges, as well as areas of particular concern such as the following.

Our respondents reported the greatest need for training in human relations skills, followed by skills involved in dealing with current special problems, people-management skills, further academic studies, and information management skills. Consistent with these priorities was the set of specific training activities in highest demand: developing goals and operating programs; relating to people of other races and cultures; interviewing, one-to-one work; group dynamics techniques; conducting meetings that get things done; and leadership training. The major training emphasis, then, was not on research or instruction, but on planning and interpersonal relations. These are areas at the core of many local EPDA V-E programs, especially the institutes.

The uniformity of demand across respondent roles was striking: a professional's IHE role did not appear to affect his perceptions of the need for training generally or for particular types of training. However, respondents did seem to take role considerations into account when prescribing training for themselves and others. Further academic training was recommended mainly for tenured and non-tenured faculty, including department chairmen, and training in managerial and information management skills for non-instructional personnel and department chairmen. Training was most frequently targeted at persons filling roles with wide-ranging responsibilities--presidents, deans, department chairmen, student affairs personnel and academic counselors.

We conclude, then, that the EPDA V-E emphasis on the preparation of administrators is indeed well placed. In view of the high relative demand for training in human relations skills in general and personal and job counseling in particular, our findings also suggest increased V-E support for the training of counselors and other educational specialists in whose roles these skills are particularly valuable.

How do personnel needs arise? We asked the college presidents whether skill shortages were a problem of "people," money," or "institutional resistance." Their answer was money, overwhelmingly: they feel that the colleges and the skilled personnel are both ready to get together, whenever the necessary funds become available. In the meanwhile, the presidents evidence substantial demand for in-service training of the kinds that EPDA has provided to date, as well as some new kinds; Volume II documents the structure of this demand. They seem to look to in-service training primarily to sharpen professionals' skills in their current roles, not as a mechanism to facilitate retraining and personnel reshuffling.

The program profiles and the accompanying cross-program summaries that appear in Volume III of this report describe the emphases and penetration of the EPDA V-E programs. These programs seek to meet "critical shortages" in higher education both by training professionals for specific occupations in specific kinds of IHEs, and also by providing direct aid to the institutions hosting the programs and to the participants in them. In FY 1970, $5 million was given to 92 institute programs, and $4 million to 50 two-year fellowship programs (about half of the fellowship budget went directly to the fellows themselves) for a total of 142 programs involving some 5000 participants. In our sample of 2038 participants in 92 programs, we found that 21% of the programs were hosted by institutions that were either developing or predominantly non-white or both. About 58% of the programs were specifically designed to provide training for work with disadvantaged populations, and 23% of our respondents were themselves members of minority groups. Furthermore, in a separate survey of 300 fellows receiving EPDA aid, we found that 273 declared

their intention to pursue IHE careers, and that 119 of them were in some way influenced by EPDA V-E funds in their choice of careers.

Such evidence suggests that EPDA V-E funds are indeed helping to supply American higher education with trained professionals, through two different types of programs. Fellowship programs last one or two years, are uniformly funded at about $5000 per student per year, and terminate in the award of a graduate degree. The number of fellowships assigned to a host institution ranges from 4 to 27; the average is 8. Institute programs, on the other hand, are short-term, outside the normal course offerings and not for credit, and funded through a direct grant to the host institution for all or part of the cost--typically, about 90%. While institute programs average 52 participants for a cost of $59,900, the range is wide--from 5 participants at $8500 to 300 participants at $271,400--with a similarly broad range in program content.

The distribution of the number trained in EPDA V-E fellowship and institute programs, broken down by the kinds of occupations and institutions for which participants were prepared, shows a concentration on the training of administrators for four-year colleges. While administration was definitely the emphasis of training programs for service in four-year colleges, programs for two-year colleges stressed the preparation of teacher/administrators and teachers. Training programs for educational specialists accounted for the fewest participants. In broad terms, these priorities do speak to the personnel requirements perceived by key managers in the field, as discussed in Volume II, with the possible exception of a strong demand for personal and job counselors. While it cannot be assumed that the number of participants trained in future years will necessarily be tailored to meet perceived shortages and training needs, the results of the program profiling effort demonstrated that our information system can provide the basis for drawing such conclusions.

Our findings and our experiences in gathering the profiles and summaries suggest that USOE does not currently gather the data that

would permit the kind of formative and summative evaluation that the EPDA V-E program needs. For instance, adequate measures of success and quality are currently unavailable. In critical areas such as program costs and participant characteristics and intentions, we encountered frequent instances of inaccurate, incomplete, or missing data. Details of our findings appear in Section 2.1 of Volume III.

The transitional colleges which we examined in detail in our case studies, documented in Volume IV of this report, evidenced patterns of training need similar to those of the more traditional colleges whose leaders responded to our Training Preference Survey. In four out of six case studies, as in the survey results, we discerned a wide-spread demand for people with skills which would facilitate meeting the needs of the "new student." The pressure to cope with an academic environment not really designed fo· him and at the same time to function at the more pragmatic level of everyday living creates a broad range of personal and academic counseling requirements for such a student. Job counseling needs surfaced in two ways: many students expressed dissatisfaction with the level of job placement activities on campus; integration of course and job content became crucial in cooperative forms of education. We also found evidence of a need for better career development services in colleges developing 13th and 14th year programs. The additional staff and program development efforts required to mount such services in turn create new financial and administrative manpower needs.

In the colleges attempting to eliminate entrance barriers, open admissions creates a need for specialists in remedial education and for faculty who can accommodate a remedial emphasis. Regardless of whether open admissions proves a viable approach to assisting the "disadvantaged" student, many institutions will certainly continue to attempt to serve the disadvantaged. Developing and/or non-white institutions will consequently continue to need teachers and trainers who are qualified to offer a program of a remedial nature. Additionally, planners and devel-

opers who are sensitive to these kinds of needs will also be necessary at all levels of the organization.

Various other kinds of needs emerged in the case studies. Some of them may represent new trends for manpower development; others may be on the decline. In the university without walls scenario, for instance, the need for coordinators who can establish and maintain functional connections between student work and study activities is almost at a crisis level. However, there is some question as to the future of this particular role, since the university program is adapting to current economic trends which involve less reliance on traditional work-study concepts. The possibility of using coordinators in more intense counseling situations arises here, and with it the concept of in-service training as a means of implementing better work-study programs through staff and faculty development. This approach also surfaced in the developing black college, where funding has become a serious constraint to operation and staff turnover has been high. Efforts at belt tightening and development of resources at hand are expected to bring positive results.

As long as the traditional requirements for attaining University status remain the same, aspiring colleges will face needs for research-oriented faculty and graduate programs. To develop a professional school requires manpower to initiate, organize and maintain these satellites. With the addition of new components and the consequent increase in campus population, the emerging university faces needs for administration and management.

In sum, the major training needs which emerged from the case studies were: human relations, especially personal and job counseling; and management, especially program planning, development and evaluation. The case studies were also characterized by an emphasis on coordination and liaison skills, and on skills appropriate for work with disadvantaged populations. While these training requirements took varied and

occasionally unique forms on individual campuses, in the main they are consistent with the skill needs identified in the Training Preference Survey and with the thrust of the EPDA V-E program as described in the profiling effort. We therefore conclude that the training requirements of transitional colleges of the types represented in the case studies differ primarily in degree rather than in kind from those of traditional colleges. Transitional colleges most assuredly indicate new problems and training priorities, but not totally new training demands.

Bibliography

Clurman, Michael, "How Shall We Finance Higher Education?" The Public Interest, No. 19, Spring, 1970.

Davies, Don, [1] "Come Out From Under the Ivy," American Education, March, 1970, Vol. 6, No. 2.

_____, [2] "What EPDA Will Mean to Schools," Nation's Schools, September, 1968, Vol. 82, No. 3.

Education Amendments of 1971, Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, on S. 659.

The Education Professions 1968: A Report on the People Who Serve Our Schools and Colleges, U.S. Depart ment of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1969.

_____ 1969-70: An Annual Report on the People Who Serve Our Schools and Colleges, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1970.

Ellis, Harlan Reed, II, "Education Professions Development Act," American Education, October, 1967, Vol. 3, No. 9.

"Federal Funds Meeting Educational Manpower Needs," American Education, May, 1971, Vol. 7, No. 4.

Fields, Cheryl, "There's Still a Long Road to Travel Before Colleges Get U.S. Aid," The Chronicle of Higher Education, November, 1971, Vol. VI, No. 8.

Higher Education Amendments of 1967, Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninetieth Congress, First Session, on H.R. 6232 and H.R. 6265.

Manpower Report of the President and A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training by the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1967.

_____, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Public Law 89-329, 89th Congress, H.R. 9567, November 8, 1965, "The Higher Education Act of 1965."

Public Law 90-35, 90th Congress, H.R. 10943, June 29, 1967, "The Education Professions Development Act."

Public Law 90-575, 90th Congress, S. 3769, October 16, 1968, "Higher Education Amendments of 1968."

Report No. 363, Senate, Amending and extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, June 27, 1967.

Report No. 373, House of Representatives, Amending and extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, June 20, 1967.

Report on Higher Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1971.

S. 659, "Education Amendments of 1971", in the Senate of the United States, November 24, 1971.

Valien, Preston, The Higher Education Amendments of 1968, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1969.